

20 OCT 1980

## Category: Protective Services

Background: Protective services for Agency buildings in the Washington area, including the Headquarters compound, are provided by the Federal Protective Service (FPS) of the General Services Administration (GSA). Federal Protective Officers (FPO's) are assigned to Agency buildings from five separate FPS zones, one of which is totally dedicated to the protection of the Headquarters compound, [REDACTED] STATINTL

[REDACTED] The working relationship between the FPS and the Agency has been generally cooperative over the years. With the formation of the FPS in 1971, the FPO's have not only provided physical protection but have served as on-site police authority at our installations.

A small portion of the FPS coverage of the Headquarters compound and certain other Agency buildings is provided by GSA under the Standard Level User Charge (SLUC) umbrella. This minimum amount is determined by GSA in the context that Agency buildings require only basic protective services similar to nonsensitive government facilities, e.g., the Department of Agriculture.

The sensitive nature of Agency facilities and operations dictates that this basic SLUC coverage be dramatically augmented to meet our security requirements. This augmentation is accomplished with GSA cooperation, but within the limits of available FPS manpower on a reimbursable basis, sometimes at an overtime rate. Reimbursement charges for FPS services in recent years have been escalating; at the present time the GSA regular hourly rate of reimbursement is \$12.82 and the overtime rate, \$19.23.

Problem: As in other areas, the GSA-FPS appears to be overworked and understaffed in providing protective services. In addition, the FPS seems philosophically moving in the direction of becoming a police support organization, while the vast majority of Agency protective requirements continue to be of the guard service variety. Further, as noted in other GSA support activities, the FPS has been in a monopolistic position in serving our needs. This monopoly has encumbered the responsiveness of the FPS to serve our requirements. At least on one occasion the FPS has unilaterally decided to reduce protective coverage of Agency installations without even advance notification. It has also inhibited our ability to respond in immediate fashion to emergency coverage requirements. In the past several months, the FPS requested that the Agency immediately implement a severe reduction in its protective coverage, simply because the FPS was unable to recruit a full complement against its own established billet ceiling.

Our General Counsel has acknowledged the responsibility of the FPS to provide protective coverage to GSA buildings. Counsel has also advised that this FPS responsibility does not inhibit nor encroach upon the Agency's own responsibility and authority to establish access controls for Agency installations and to use alternative resources to FPS to implement these controls. Use of such alternatives would not include their exercise of police powers.

Recommendation: It is recommended that the Agency conduct a thorough, updated analysis of the protective service requirements of its Washington area installations, identify options for meeting these requirements, determine the advantages and disadvantages associated with these options, and seek a more cost-effective and responsive method for satisfying our needs. Depending upon the results of this analysis, it is further recommended that the Agency exercise the option of providing protective services using methods and resources in addition to, or other than, the Federal Protective Service.